

Comparison of Selected State Criminal Background Check Laws and Proposed Legislation (2010)*

State	Bill or Law Number	Ban the Box	Employers Regulated		Required Screening Standards	Screening Factors Including Rehabilitation
			Private Employers	Public Employers		
California		X		X	None	
Connecticut	CGS §§ 46a-80	X		X	None	X
Hawaii	HRS §§ 378-2, 378-2.5	X	X	X	Record must have a "rational relationship" to the job sought	
Maryland <i>Bill not passed</i>	SB 581, HB 749	X		X	None	
Massachusetts	M.G.L. Ch. 6 §§ 168-173	X	X	X	None	
Minnesota	Minn. Stat. § 364	X		X	Record must be "directly related" to the job sought	X
Nebraska <i>Postponed</i>	Leg. Bill 913	X		X	Record must be "directly related" to job sought	
New Mexico	N.M. Stat. § 28-2-3	X		X	None	
New Jersey <i>Pending</i>	A1757	X		X	Requires a "direct relationship" to the job sought	X
New York	NY Corr. Law §§ 752, 753		X	X	Record must have a "direct relationship" to the job sought	X
Pennsylvania	Pa. Cons. Stat. §§ 9124, 9125		X	X	Record has to "relate" to the job sought	
Rhode Island <i>Pending</i>	House Bill 8060		X	X	None	X
Wisconsin	Wisc. Stat. §§ 111.321, 111.322		X	X	Record must be "substantially related" to the job sought	

* For more detailed information on state laws regulating criminal background checks, see Love, Margaret Colgate. "Relief from the Collateral Consequences of a Criminal Conviction: A State-by-State Resource Guide." Table #6 – Consideration of Criminal Record in Licensing and Employment. March 2007. (Available online at <http://www.sentencingproject.org/doc/File/Collateral%20Consequences/table6.pdf>).